



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,664	07/20/2006	Ammad Akram	AAT-105US	7811
53473	7590	08/08/2008		
RATNERPRESTIA				
P.O. BOX 980				
VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482				
EXAMINER				
CHAKOUR, ISSAM				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
4163				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/08/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/561,664

**Applicant(s)**

AKRAM ET AL.

**Examiner**

ISSAM CHAKOUR

**Art Unit**

4163

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 12-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7-11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 December 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12-16-2005
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 7-11 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim may not depend from any other multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, these claims have not been further treated on the merits.

Claims 1-4 are objected to because of the following informalities: In claims 1 and 4, the word "synchronised" is misspelled. The dependent claims inherit this deficiency. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

The claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 12, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because these claims recite "computer program" not associated with a computer readable medium which is non-statutory subject matter.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-4, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kallio (US 2002/0147008).

4. In claim 1, Kallio discloses a method of operating a mobile communications node which has at least two different interfaces (See paragraph [0027]) for providing connectivity with first and second different communications networks respectively (See abstract and figure 1), and which is receiving data from a remote corresponding node (e.g. MSC, see figure 1, item 120) via the first network (GSM network, see abstract), in which: in response to a trigger (See paragraph [0013], lines 11-12), a SIP protocol (See paragraph [0033]) related handover request is generated by the mobile node to initiate handover from the first network to the second network (e.g. WLAN, see abstract); on completion of handover the first network interface is set to sleep mode or switched OFF (See paragraph [0048], line 5); and the initiation of sleep mode is synchronized with the

cessation of the receipt of data packets via the first network (See paragraph [0013], lines 8-9).

5. In reference to claim 2, Kallio teaches the method in accordance with claim 1 in which the trigger (e.g. handover command) is a signal sent to the mobile node (See paragraph [0050], line 6).

6. In reference to claim 3, Kallio discloses the method according to claim 1, in which the trigger (the trigger is a handover initiation signal sent from the mobile node) is a signal generated by the mobile node (See table of steps in page 7, step 5).

7. With respect to claim 4, Kallio further discloses that the handover request is sent from the mobile node (See paragraph [0054], lines 4-5; Note that the request is a result of testing for certain conditions and parameter thresholds of signals received from the base-stations) to the corresponding node (e.g. mobile switching center- MSC) via the second network (e.g. GSM network) and the initiation of sleep mode (or switching off the corresponding interface upon successful handover process, see paragraph [0048], lines 5-6) is synchronized with the mobile node receiving an acknowledgement message from the corresponding node (See paragraph [0057], lines 5-7).

8. In reference to claim 12, Kallio further teaches a computer program product for installation in a mobile communications node (e.g. the handover algorithm, see paragraph [0054], lines 1-2), which mobile node has at least two different interfaces (See abstract and figure 1) for providing connectivity with first and second different communications networks respectively whereby when the mobile node is receiving data from a remote corresponding node (e.g. MSC, see figure 1, item 120) the data stream

Art Unit: 4163

can be handed over from one network to the other (See abstract), the program when installed enabling the mobile node to set to sleep mode the interface for the first network following handover to the second network (See paragraph [0048], line 5) in synchronization with the cessation (e.g. release of resources, see [0058], lines 8-10) of the receipt of data packets via the first network.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
3. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kallio.
9. Regarding claim 5, Kallio teaches the method in accordance with claims 1, 2, and 3 respectively in which the handover request is sent from the mobile node to the corresponding node via the second network (Note that the second network is the GSM

network, See paragraph [0054], lines 4-5), an acknowledgement message (note that the handoff command is an acknowledgement message as well) returned from the corresponding node (See paragraph [0057], lines 6-7), and the initiation of sleep mode for the first network interface is synchronized with the sending of the acknowledgement message by the mobile node (See paragraph [0048], line 5).

10. Kallio fails to explicitly teach an acknowledgement message is sent from the mobile node to the corresponding node.

11. However, the examiner takes official notice that it is well known in the art, that, after authenticating, providing the new IP address from the corresponding node, and finalizing the handoff process, sending another ACK signal to the corresponding node by the mobile node is solely for securing records of robust communication sessions and validating successful handoffs. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize acknowledgement message to the CN from MN as a notification of the end of a handoff session because it constitutes a further measure to ensure robust transfer of data. Note further that this modification assures that reliability issues that may arise from synchronous problematic events are mitigated.

4. Claims 6, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kallio in view of Davis et al (US 6,105,064).

12. Regarding claim 6, Kallio teaches the method in accordance with claims 1, 2, and 3 respectively. Kallio fails to teach explicitly that the sleep mode for the first network terminal is initiated in response to a marker in the received data stream indicating that

the stream via the first network has come to an end. However, Davis teaches marking packets of data for indicating certain information or triggering a step in a process (See column 5, lines 60-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the technique as taught by Davis to trigger in Kallio's invention the sleep mode or switching off the first network interface to reduce battery power consumption on one hand and to validate the successful handoff session by transmitting an acknowledge message to the CN on the other.

13. Regarding claim 13, Kallio discloses as in claim 12 the computer readable medium having instructions (e.g. the handover algorithm, see paragraph [0054], lines 1-2) for enabling the mobile node to initiate sleep mode (See paragraph [0048], line 5) for the first network interface. Kallio fails to teach explicitly that the initiation of sleep mode is in response to a marker in the received data stream indicating that the stream via the first network has come to an end. However, Davis teaches marking packets of data for indicating certain information or triggering a step in a process (e.g. indicating that data transmission has come to an end, see column 5, lines 60-63.). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the technique as taught by Davis to trigger in Kallio's invention the sleep mode or switching off the first network interface to reduce battery power consumption on one hand and on another to validate the successful handoff session by transmitting an acknowledge message to the CN.

14. In reference to claim 14, Kallio in view of Davis teaches the limitations as in claim 12; Davis as mentioned above (See column 5, lines 60-63) teaches using the marked



Art Unit: 4163

information contained in portion of the data stream to trigger a step in a process (e.g. sending a validating ACK message to the CN). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the technique as taught by Davis to trigger in Kallio's invention switching off the first network interface to validate the successful handoff session by transmitting an acknowledge message to the CN as a reliability measure.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Hason et al (US 2005/0250496) teaches a handoff communication method for heterogeneous wireless networks while minimizing power consumption of portable devices used in the communication with said networks.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ISSAM CHAKOUR whose telephone number is (571)270-5889. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (7:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Robinson can be reached on 5712722319. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 4163

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

IC

/Mark A. Robinson/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4163